



**City of Burbank
Park, Recreation and
Community Services Department**

Memorandum

Date: May 8, 2014
To: Park, Recreation and Community Services Board Members
From: Judie Wilke, Park, Recreation and Community Services Director
Subject: **FEASIBILITY OF DEVELOPING AN OFF-LEASH DOG PARK UPDATE**

RECOMMENDATION:

Per the Park, Recreation and Community Services (PRCS) Board's (Board) recommendation at the March 13, 2014 meeting, staff recommends the Board note and file the item. However, the Board may take any action it deems necessary and appropriate.

BACKGROUND:

The development of a dog park has been discussed on and off since 1997. Since then, staff has been working with the City Council (Council) and the Board in assessing the feasibility of developing an off-leash dog park. More recently, at the Board's March 13, 2014 meeting, staff engaged the Board, the overseeing body of the dog park project, with a discussion regarding the status of the potential development. While staff advised the Board that the development of a dog park aligns with the PRCS Department's overall mission, staff identified challenges with all twelve potential sites (Exhibit A) that were previously reviewed and discussed by the Council and Board. At this meeting, the Board recommended that staff invite the community to the Board's May 8, 2014 meeting to participate in a discussion regarding the viability of developing a dog park.

DISCUSSION:

In alignment with the Board's recommendation, staff would like to continue engaging the Board and the community with discussions regarding the development including challenges of a potential dog park. Consequently, staff invited the community to Board's regularly scheduled meeting on May 8, 2014 by placing an advertisement in the local newspaper, distributed a press release to media sources, emailed an announcement to members of the community who have shared interest in the project, placed a banner on the City's main website, provided the Mayor with an announcement for the May 6, 2014 Council meeting, and announced it at the Board's April 21, 2014 meeting.

In addition to community outreach, staff reviewed potential sites (Exhibit B) and assessed the following: proximity to other dog parks, adjacent land use compatibility,

environmental considerations, vehicular and pedestrian access, visibility, and neighborhood concerns. Subsequently, staff identified the following:

- There are a total of seven dog parks located within a 14-mile radius of the City, of which two of the seven are less than one mile away from the City's border;
- Perceived issues and concerns regarding dog parks will arise when adjacent land use is residential (noise level of barking dogs, smell of dog waste, parking issues, etc.);
- Onsite parking is not provided in close proximity to any of the potential sites;
- There is not new available open space to accommodate a dog park;
- All identified sites will take existing open space (developed or undeveloped) from parks; and
- Funding is not available for the development or ongoing maintenance of the project.

While it is important to consider development costs associated with the project, these costs are unknown because a location and specific design elements for the project have not been solidified. However, staff anticipates that the development costs for a dog park could range from \$100,000 to \$300,000 depending on the size of the facility and the amenities selected. To that end, staff believes that a portion of the development costs could be offset through grant opportunities, and private and non-profit sponsorships/partnerships. However, it is important to note that funding has not been allocated towards the development or ongoing maintenance needs of the project.

The ongoing maintenance for such a facility is currently unknown, but it is important to note that dog parks require a significant amount of maintenance when compared to traditional parks. Due to the intense use that these facilities experience, the maintenance costs are estimated to be approximately 30% more a year. On average, the City spends approximately \$14,500 a year to maintain one acre of traditional developed parkland. In addition to ongoing maintenance costs, funding will also be needed for staffing. Although staffing is unknown, staff anticipates that staffing costs could be approximately \$55,000 a year.

FISCAL IMPACT

The fiscal impact is unknown at this time because a viable location has not been identified.

CONCLUSION

Currently, the City is relatively built out and there is a lack of General Fund dollars for the development and ongoing maintenance costs associated with the project. Although, there is a limited amount of land and funding resources available to develop such a facility, staff will continue to meet with the City Manager on how to best move forward with the proposed dog park project. Staff will keep the Board and the community abreast of any updates regarding the dog park.

EXHIBITS

- A - Potential Dog Park Sites
- B - Dog Park Site Challenges

EXHIBIT A

POTENTIAL DOG PARK SITES



1. Brace Canyon Park (City-Owned Property)
 2. Bel Aire Park (City-Owned Property)
 3. Johnny Carson Park North (City-Owned Property)
 4. Johnny Carson Park South (LA Owned Property-leased to City)
 5. Whitnall Highway Easement South (City-Owned Property)
 6. Whitnall Highway Easement North (Los Angeles Department of Water and Power Owned Property)
 7. Palm Park (City-Owned Property)
 8. Starlight Bowl Parking Lot at Stough Park (City-Owned Property)
 9. Wood Lot Area (City-Owned Property)
 10. Cabrini Basin (City-Owned Property)
 11. Interstate 5- HOV Right of Way (City-Owned Property)
 12. Lundigan Park (City-Owned Property)
- Directly Adjacent Dog Parks.

DOG PARK SITE CHALLENGES

POTENTIAL SITE	CHALLENGES
1) Brace Canyon Park (City-Owned Property)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ingress/egress impacts same neighborhood affected by park programming. • Located in residential area. • Proximity to adjacent resident homes. • Existing site would require grading to become suitable for use. • Area is adjacent to reservoir which could create water quality issues.
2) Bel Aire Park (City-Owned Property)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ingress/egress impacts same neighborhood affected by park programming. • Located in residential area. • Proximity to adjacent resident homes. • Limited street parking. • Currently utilized as an active ballfield facility. Redeveloping site would result in programming issues and a loss of revenue for the PRCS Department. • No permanent restroom facilities.
3) Johnny Carson Park North (City-Owned Property)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans to redevelop park are currently underway and scope of that project does not include such a facility. • Impact existing developed park acreage. • Adjacent to freeway invites non-resident usage. • Area relies on street parking. • Impacted by Media District traffic and surrounding uses.
4) Johnny Carson Park South (Los Angeles Owned Property- leased to the City)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts existing developed park acreage. • Adjacent to freeway (dog safety). • Area relies on street parking. • Impacted by Media District traffic and surrounding uses. • Borders residential neighborhood. • Could impact adjacent equestrian trails. • Areas will be used as staging site for LADWP upper reach project.
5) Whitnall Highway Easement South (City-Owned Property)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in residential area. • Proximity to adjacent resident homes. • Ingress/egress would impact residential neighborhood. • Limited street parking. • Impact existing parkland acreage. • No restroom facilities or irrigation system. • Close proximity to other dog parks outside of city boundaries (1.3 miles).
6) Whitnall Highway Easement North (Los Angeles Department of Water and Power Owned Property)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ingress/egress would impact residential neighborhood. • LADWP easement land use issues. • No restroom facilities.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No irrigation system or water supply. • Limited street parking. • Close proximity to other dog parks outside of city boundaries (.35 miles).
7) Palm Park (City-Owned Property)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not viable because there is a reservoir. A dog park can't be built over a reservoir due to water quality issues. • Ingress/egress impacts same neighborhood affected by park programming. • No dedicated parking. • Located in residential area. • Proximity to adjacent resident homes. • Currently utilized as an active ballfield facility. Redeveloping site would result in programming issues and a loss of revenue for PRCS Department. • No permanent restroom facilities.
8) Starlight Bowl Parking Lot at Stough Park (City-Owned Property)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ingress/egress would impact same neighborhood affected by Castaway, DeBell, Starlight Bowl and Nature Center traffic. • Upper portion of lot is over landfill and cannot be developed into an active park site due to ground settlement and regulatory issues. • No existing irrigation. • Would negatively impact programming at the Starlight Bowl.
9) Wood Lot Area (City-Owned Property)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ingress/egress would impact same neighborhood affected by Castaway, DeBell, Starlight Bowl and Nature Center traffic. • No restroom facilities. • No existing irrigation. • Currently, existing access is restricted. • Impacts to other City uses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BWP and PW wood lot storage area might have to be relocated ○ Security issues for site because it's near BWP training facility.
10) Cabrini Basin (City-Owned Property)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ingress/egress would impact residential neighborhoods. • One access point on private property and located immediately across from residential neighborhood. • No existing water supply, irrigation, restroom facilities, or dedicated parking.
11) Interstate 5-HOV Right of Way (City-Owned Property)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent to freeway (dog safety). • Land better suited for a developed property with a higher use – Economic Development.
12) Lundigan Park (City-Owned Property)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact existing parkland acreage (already very limited open space). • Located in residential area. • Ingress/egress would impact residential neighborhood. • Limited street parking.